

UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
NORTHERN DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA

IN RE: VOLKSWAGEN “CLEAN DIESEL”
MARKETING, SALES PRACTICES, AND
PRODUCTS LIABILITY LITIGATION
MDL No. 2672 CRB (JSC)
**ORDER DENYING MOTIONS TO
REMAND**

This Order Relates To:

MDL Dkt. Nos. 1029, 1281, 1370, 1398,
1747, 2003, 2760

Richardson v. VWGoA, No. 3:16-cv-0709-
CRB, Dkt. No. 9

Before this Court approved the 2.0-liter and 3.0-liter class settlements (*see* MDL Dkt. Nos. 2102, 3229), it stayed all pending motions to remand actions in the MDL to state court or to the transferor district courts (*see* MDL Dkt. No. 1643). The stay was entered so that members of the putative settlement classes could consider the terms of the settlement agreements.

After approving the 2.0-liter and 3.0-liter class settlements, the Court, on July 20, 2017, issued Pretrial Order (“PTO”) No. 23. There, the Court lifted the stay on any remaining motions to remand and instructed plaintiffs who had “previously filed a motion to remand, and who intend[ed] to pursue the motion, [to] re-notice the motion on or before August 11, 2017.” (MDL Dkt. No. 3481.) The Court further explained, “If a plaintiff who previously filed a remand motion does not re-notice his or her motion by August 11, the Court will DISMISS the motion.” (*Id.*)

More than 60 motions to remand were re-noticed or filed for the first time after PTO No. 23. But a number of plaintiffs who had filed remand motions prior to PTO No. 23 did not re-

1 notice their motions on or before August 11, 2017, as PTO No. 23 instructed. Those filed but not
2 re-noticed remand motions include the following: ECF Nos. 1029, 1281, 1370, 1398, 1747, 2003,
3 2760, and *Richardson*, ECF No. 9. Because these motions were not re-noticed, as the Court
4 instructed in PTO No. 23, they are DENIED.

5 **IT IS SO ORDERED.**

6 Dated: March 13, 2019



CHARLES R. BREYER
United States District Judge